

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

JAMES EDWARD SCOTT, III.

Case No. 3:22-CV-00564-ART-CLB

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO EXTEND
TIME AND GRANTING MOTION TO
PROVIDE DEFENDANT'S TRUE NAME**

SGT. FNU HERZOG, *et al.*,

[ECF Nos. 59, 60]

Defendants.

10 This case involves a civil rights action filed by Plaintiff James Edward Scott, III
11 (“Scott”), an inmate in the custody of the Nevada Department of Corrections (“NDOC”).
12 Currently pending before the Court are Scott’s motion to extend time to amend the
13 pleadings, (ECF No. 59), and motion to provide the true name of Defendant Johnson,
14 (ECF No. 60). For the reasons stated below, the Court denies Scott’s motion to extend
15 time and grants the motion to provide the Defendant’s true name.

I. MOTION TO EXTEND TIME

17 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) governs the modification of scheduling
18 orders and discovery plans. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4) provides that “[a] schedule may be
19 modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent.” The good cause inquiry
20 focuses primarily on the movant's diligence. *DRK Photo v. McGraw-Hill Global Educ.*
21 *Holdings, LLC*, 870 F.3d 978, 989 (9th Cir. 2017).

22 Local Rule 26-3 supplements Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 and provides that discovery plans
23 and scheduling orders may be modified for good cause, provided that a motion to extend
24 is made "no later than 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline." See LR 26-
25 3; see also LR IA 6-1. A request made within 21 days of the subject deadline must be
26 supported by a showing of good cause. LR 26-3. "Good cause" is a non-rigorous standard
27 that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts. See
28 *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010). Requests for

1 extensions of time made before the applicable deadline has passed should “normally ...
 2 be granted in the absence of bad faith on the part of the party seeking relief or prejudice
 3 to the adverse party.” *Id.* (*citing* 4B Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal*
 4 *Practice and Procedure* § 1165 (3d ed. 2004)).

5 Any request made after the expiration of the subject deadline will only be granted
 6 if “the movant also demonstrates that the failure to act was the result of excusable
 7 neglect.” LR 26-3. “Excusable neglect” is a flexible, equitable concept, but “inadvertence,
 8 ignorance of the rules, or mistakes construing the rules do not usually constitute
 9 ‘excusable’ neglect.” *Kyle v. Campbell Soup Co.*, 28 F.3d 928, 931 (9th Cir. 1994) (*citing*
 10 *Pioneer Inv. Servs. v. Brunswick Assocs.*, 507 U.S. 380, 391-92 (1993)).

11 Scott’s motion to extend time to file an amended complaint was filed on July 2,
 12 2024, and seeks to extend the deadline from July 1, 2024, to September 1, 2024. (ECF
 13 No. 59.) Scott seeks to amend his complaint to include “newly discovered information
 14 that was revealed in the initial disclosures” which he received on June 17, 2024. (*Id.*)
 15 Based on this new information, Scott seeks to amend his complaint to add two
 16 defendants. (*Id.*)

17 From the timeline described in the motion, Scott received the information about the
 18 two defendants fourteen days before the expiration of the deadline to amend.¹ Scott does
 19 not explain why he was unable to file an amended complaint by the current deadline of
 20 July 1, 2024 but rather chose to immediately file a motion to extend time. Further, Scott
 21 does not explain *why* he needs to amend the complaint to add the defendants. Scott only
 22 states that he “has discovered two new defendants and as a direct consequence must
 23 amend the pleadings made in the operative complaint.” (*Id.*) Although good cause is a
 24 non-rigorous standard, Scott must still provide the Court with something to support a
 25 finding of good cause. *Ahanchian*, 624 F.3d at 1259. Here, Scott merely states he “must”
 26

27 ¹ The timeliness of the motion to extend time is suspect, as the motion was filed on
 28 the Court’s electronic filing system on July 2, 2024. (ECF No. 59.) However, the motion
 itself is dated on June 18, 2024. (*Id.* at 2.) Giving leniency to Scott as a *pro se* litigant, the
 Court will evaluate the motion as being filed before the subject deadline of July 1, 2024.

1 amend the pleadings. This is insufficient to show why Scott could not file an amended
2 complaint during the two-week period between discovering the information and the
3 deadline. Thus, the Court denies Scott's motion to extend time to file an amended
4 complaint. (ECF No. 59.)

5 **II. MOTION TO PROVIDE DEFENDANT'S TRUE NAME**

6 Next, Scott filed a "Motion to Provide the True Name of Defendant Johnson as
7 Joseph Johnson." (ECF No. 60.) This motion seeks to update the docket to reflect the full
8 name of Defendant Johnson for his true name, "Joseph Johnson." (*Id.*) On April 15, 2024,
9 the Court granted Scott's motion to amend the Court's screening order in part, allowing
10 Scott to assert claims against Defendant Johnson. (See ECF No. 41.) The Court ordered
11 the Clerk of the Court to add Johnson to the docket as a defendant. (*Id.*) Now, Scott
12 requests the docket be updated to reflect the Defendant's true name, Joseph Johnson.
13 (ECF No. 60.) The Court grants this motion directs the Clerk of the Court to update the
14 docket to reflect Defendant Johnson's true name: "Joseph Johnson."

15 **III. CONCLUSION**

16 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Scott's motion to extend time to amend the
17 pleadings, (ECF No. 59), is **DENIED**.

18 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Scott's motion to provide Defendant's true name,
19 (ECF No. 60), is **GRANTED**.

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court update the docket to reflect
21 Defendant Johnson's true name: "Joseph Johnson."

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 **DATED:** July 3, 2024.

24 
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

25
26
27
28